4.8 MINERAL RESOURCES

4.8.1 Introduction

This section of the EIR describes existing mineral resources in the project area and analyzes the potential for new residential development or implementation of the Open Space Plan to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, or the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

Information in this section is based on information in the Revised EIR Addendum for the Ellwood Beach/Santa Barbara Shores Specific Plan (County of Santa Barbara, 1998). Full bibliographic entries for all reference materials appear in Section 4.8.6 (References) of this section.

No comments related to mineral resources were received in response to the NOP circulated for the project or at the Public Scoping meeting held on August 13, 2003.

4.8.2 Existing Setting

As a part of the NOP, a preliminary list of potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project was reviewed. It was determined that the University's project would have a less-than-significant impact on mineral resources. More specifically, it was determined that the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. Further, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

4.8.2.1 Historical and Current Oil and Gas Operations in COPR

Historically, the Ellwood oil field was one of the most productive oil fields in the area. The discovery well for the area was drilled in 1928 and it produced clean, high-grade oil. The peak productive life of the field was reportedly between 1928 and 1931. Oil and gas produced from the wells was stored in aboveground tanks until ready to be processed. Pipelines transported the oil to the Barnsdall Oil Company oil and gas plant, where it was distilled into gasoline. Gasoline left the pipeline for an offshore loading dock and onto tankers. These development sites, long since closed, have been identified and largely remediated.

The COPR Expansion Area portion of the overall COPR site has been used for oil production, storage, and shipping operations since the 1920s. Arco previously operated an oil/natural gasprocessing unit on the 0.35-acre Bishop Tank Farm lease in the southwest portion of the site. The processing unit was built in the early 1970s and was operational until 1987 when it was dismantled. The Ellwood Marine Terminal has been operational since the 1930s and consists of a network of former and active tanks, piped on the property, but has been reduced in size and is currently a 17.6-acre parcel.

Section 4.8

Mineral
Resources

In summary, no known economically recoverable mineral resources are located within the North Campus or West Campus. The boundaries of the Ellwood oil field and other gas fields are within the vicinity of the project area; however, the onshore portions of these sites are no longer used for petroleum or gas extraction. Oil and gas extraction in the Ellwood oil field still occurs offshore.

4.8.3 Regulatory Framework

4.8.3.1 Federal

There are no federal regulations, authorities, or administering agencies that regulate the proposed project pertaining to mineral resources.

4.8.3.2 State

Public Resources Code (Sections 3000 through 3865) regulates petroleum and gas exploration and the operation and closure of wells. The California Geological Survey is the state agency responsible for inventorying and mapping mineral resources in California. Regulations pursuant to the California Geological Survey mineral resource determinations are generally linked with County Land Use Elements and other types of local/regional development rules, but would not be triggered for the proposed project.

4.8.3.3 **Local**

The California Geological Survey is the state agency responsible for inventorying and mapping mineral resources in California. As determined in numerous other CEQA documents produced for other projects in this region, there are no known economically recoverable mineral resources located within the proposed residential development and Open Space Plan areas under the jurisdiction of the County. Regulations pursuant to the California Geological Survey mineral resource determinations are generally linked with County Land Use Elements and other types of local/regional development rules, but would not be triggered by the proposed project.

4.8.4 Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.8.4.1 Methodology

For those areas in which new residential development or open space improvements may occur, information related to existing or potential resource recovery operations was reviewed, to determine whether loss of such resources, or access to such resources could occur.

4.8.4.2 LRDP Policies

The Coastal Act Element of the LRDP included a range of policies and standards (herein termed LRDP policies) to demonstrate consistency of the LRDP, and projects implemented under the

LRDP, with the statutory requirements of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act (commencing with Section 30200). No LRDP policies related to Mineral Resources have been identified.

4.8.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, implementation of the proposed project may have a significant adverse impact on agricultural resources if it would result in any of the following:

- Loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state
- Loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan

4.8.4.3 Effects Not Found to Be Significant

The Initial Study did not identify any Effects Not Found to Be Significant related to mineral resources; therefore, all potential biological resource impacts are discussed in this EIR.

4.8.4.4 <u>Impacts and Mitigation Measures</u>

Impact 4.8-1. Residential development and implementation of the Open Space Plan would not result in loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. There would be *no potential impact* No impact would result.

Amendment of the LRDP to permit residential development on the North Campus would involve development on approximately 27 acres of the North Parcel and approximately 10 acres at the Storke-Whittier Parcel, plus approximately 3 acres of existing lawn area (adjacent the West Campus Family Student Housing complex). No known economically recoverable mineral resources are located within the areas of proposed residential development. Historically, oil and gas operations have occurred in the Open Space Plan areas under the University's jurisdiction; however, these operations are now conducted from an offshore location. Implementation of the Open Space Plan would result in limited development of associated public parking and replacement of a temporary restroom. Minor development in the open space areas and management of habitat would not interfere with existing oil recovery operations, which are conducted from an offshore location.

The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. There would be *no potential impact*.

Impact 4.8-2. Residential development and implementation of the Open Space Plan would not result in loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated

Section 4.8

Mineral
Resources

on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. There would be *no potential impact* <u>No impact would result</u>.

No mineral resource recovery sites are delineated in the General Plan for the County or the GCP (prepared by the County), which covers the project area. As noted above, residential development, minor open space improvements, and management of habitat areas would not interfere with existing oil recovery operations, which are conducted from an offshore location.

The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. There would be *no potential impact*.

4.8.5 Cumulative Impacts

The Initial Study concluded that all of the Appendix G thresholds related to mineral resources were Effects Not Found to be Significant, and did not require further analysis in the EIR. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts associated with mineral resources would not be considered cumulatively considerable.

4.8.6 References

The following is a list of references for this subsection. Please refer to Section 9.0 for the master reference list.

California Department of Conservation. 2001. California Laws for the Conservation of Petroleum and Gas. Publication No. PCR01. January.

County of Santa Barbara. 1998. Revised Environmental Impact Report Addendum for the Ellwood Beach/Santa Barbara Shores Specific Plan.

County of Santa Barbara Energy Division. 1998. Revised 15164 Addendum to 91-EIR-003, Ellwood Beach, Santa Barbara Shores Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report. September.